



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/732,769	12/11/2000	Ik-Soo Lee	6192.0171.AA	2720

7590

01/16/2003

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Blvd
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102

EXAMINER

SCHECHTER, ANDREW M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 01/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/732,769

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew Schechter

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Okajima et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,334,993.

Okajima discloses [as prior art, see Fig. 2] an LCD comprising a backlight [21] and light guide [3] and a receiver means formed by engaging at least two receiving members [4 and 23, or alternatively 22 and 23, or alternatively 4 and 23 engaged with 22, or alternatively 4 engaged with 22 and 23]. Claim 1 is therefore anticipated.

With 22 and 23 being the first receptacle module and 4 the second receptacle module, and noting that all are made of the same material (plastic), claims 17 and 18 are also anticipated. The first receptacle then has first and third side walls [see Fig. 1, for instance], a bottom plate extending forward from the light source [part of 23], a second side wall with a receiving recess on its inner side to receive the light source, and

Art Unit: 2871

an end portion of the second receptacle connected to the first receptacle using a stepped portion [see Fig. 2, where 4 and 23 meet]. Claim 19 is therefore unpatentable.

4. Claims 1-4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Lewis et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,422,751.

Lewis discloses [as prior art, see Fig. 1] an LCD comprising a backlight [19] and light guide [11] and a receiver means formed by engaging at least two receiving members [any of 13, 14, 16, 17, and 18]. Claim 1 is therefore anticipated.

There is a first receptacle module [13, 14] made of plastic and a second receptacle module [16, 18] made of metal, providing the space where the backlight assembly is located. Claims 2 and 3 are also anticipated. The first receptacle has a plate and an engaging hole [into which screws 12 go]. Claim 4 is therefore anticipated as well. The first receptacle is engaged with the rear surface of the second receptacle, so claim 16 is also anticipated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5-8 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lewis* as applied to claims 1-4 above, in view of *Yamatani et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,295,103.

Considering claim 5, *Lewis* also discloses the second receptacle comprising a first and second mold frame [16 and 18] with side wall and bottom surface extended towards the receiving space to support the backlight assembly, but discloses a through-hole corresponding to the engaging hole of the first receptacle module, rather than a recess. (The examiner understands a "recess" to be a hole which does not go all the way through the piece; a "hole" might go through or not; a "through-hole" goes all the way through.) In *Lewis* the recess appears to be in the first receptacle [13], since the screws are put in from above in the figure. However, the examiner takes official notice that putting in screws from above or below to join two such pieces are art-recognized equivalents, and it would therefore be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the recess in the second receptacle (and put the screws in from below) since these are equivalent. Claim 5 is therefore unpatentable. The two are engaged by a screw, so claim 6 is also unpatentable.

Lewis discloses engaging them by a screw, but it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to engage them by using an engaging boss, heat fused or riveted, as taught by *Yamatani* in an analogous context, motivated by the desire to make a more permanent engagement, as taught by *Yamatani*. Claims 7, 8, and 13-15 are therefore unpatentable.

7. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lewis* as applied to claims 2 above, in view of *Kurihara et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,946,061.

Application/Control Number: 09/732,769
Art Unit: 2871

Lewis discloses using screws to connect the receptacles, but it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to engage them using a catching recess, with a deviation preventing cap and/or receiving recess, as taught by *Kurihara* [see Figs. 5-7], motivated by *Kurihara's* teaching that this enables the components to be "fixed without employing other components such as screws", hence allowing an easier manufacturing process. Claims 9-12 are therefore unpatentable.

8. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okajima* as applied to claim 19 above, in view of *Yamatani et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,295,103.

Okajima does not disclose how the two receptacles are connected; it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use an engaging boss as taught by *Yamatani* in an analogous context, to achieve a secure, permanent connection so that the parts do not move relative to each other. Claim 20 is therefore unpatentable.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Noting the broad language of the present claim 1, the examiner calls the attention of the applicants to the following references disclosing LCDs with various multi-part receiver means for holding backlight assemblies: U.S. Patent No. 5,986,726 to *Murai* [Fig. 2], U.S. Patent No. 6,411,501 to *Cho et al.* [Fig. 13], U.S. Patent No. 6,292,239 to *Nagamura et al.* [Fig. 9], U.S. Patent No. 6,195,148 to *Sasuga et al.* [Fig. 23], U.S. Patent No. 5,946,061 to *Kurihara* [Fig. 2], U.S. Patent No. 5,570,267 to *Ma*


Application/Control Number: 09/732,769
Art Unit: 2871


[Fig. 3], U.S. Patent No. 6,480,245 to *Sakamoto et al.* [all figures], U.S. Patent No. 6,452,649 to *Ono et al.* [Fig. 1], and U.S. Patent No. 6,392,723 [Fig. 2]. The examiner hopes that considering these references will be helpful for the applicant in responding to this office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Schechter whose telephone number is (703) 306-5801. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on (703) 305-3492. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-4711 for regular communications and (703) 746-4711 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.


Andrew Schechter
January 11, 2003


[Illegible stamp]